

REMARKS

The Office Action of August 25, 2005, has been carefully considered. Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation in the original Claim 2 which was objected to and would have been allowable if rewritten to include the limitations in Claim 1. New Claim 21 has been added which includes the limitations of the original Claim 1 and the original Claim 15 which was objected to and would have been allowable if rewritten to include the limitations in Claim 1. New Claim 22 has been added which includes the limitations of the original Claim 1 and the original Claim 6 which was objected to and would have been allowable if rewritten to include the limitations in Claim 1.

Objections to the Specification

The Office Action objected to the specification stating that it fails to provide an adequate and properly organized written description of the invention which supports the original Claim 20. Claim 20 is herein cancelled

Rejections Based on 35 USC § 112

The Office Action has rejected Claim 20 under 35 USC § 112. Claim 20 is herein cancelled.

Rejections Based on 35 USC § 102

The Office Action has rejected Claims 1, 6, and 7 under 35 USC § 102(e) as anticipated by Burnett (US 6,648,270). Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations in the original Claim 2 which was objected to and would have been allowable if rewritten to include the limitations in Claim 1. The Applicant believes that the

amended Claim 1 is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claim 1 and advanced Claim 1 to allowance.

Claims 6 and 7 depend from Claim 1. Because the Applicant believes that the amended Claim 1 is now in condition for allowance, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection of Claims 6 and 7 and advance Claims 6 and 7 to allowance.

Rejections Based on 35 USC § 103(a)

Claim 11 depends from Claim 1. Because the Applicant believes that the amended Claim 1 is now in condition for allowance, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection of Claim 11 and advance Claim 11 to allowance.

CONCLUSIONS

Claims 1, 3-11, and 13-19 remain pending in the application. Claim 1 has been amended to overcome the rejections in the Office Action mailed August 25, 2005. New Claims 21 and 22 have been added. Claims 2 and 20 have been cancelled. Claim 12 has been withdrawn. The Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner advance Claims 1, 3-11, 13-19, 21, and 22 to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Kenneth L. Green

Attorney for Applicant

Reg. No. 44,724

Averill & Varn
8244 Painter Avenue
Whittier, CA 90602
(562) 698-8039